UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,452	12/29/2004	Olivier Bremond	5551	9720
	7590 10/04/201 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.	EXAMINER		
1950 Roland Cl	arke Place	WALSH, DANIEL I		
Reston, VA 201	191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2887	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/519,452	BREMOND ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
DANIEL WALSH	2887	

	DANIEL WALSH	2887	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 September 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional street of the second of the sec	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 19-25 and 28-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	/ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See NOTE below</u> .	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/DANIEL WALSH/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2887	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

NOTE: NOTE: The Examiner notes that the claims remain rejected as per the final office action (mail date 6-24-10). The independent claims have been amended per the after final amendment, and have been broadened by removal of claim limitations. As a result, such changes now result in broader claims which necessitate further search/consideration.

The Examiner notes that the printing of barcodes in transparent of invisible inks has been discussed in Berson (col 1, lines 50+) to permit more information to be on the documents (since the codes are invisible/transparent more information can be printed on the documents because the barcodes can be applied anywhere and do not obscure the document contents like a visible code would).

With regard to when the barcode is able to be read (immediately after printing), the Examiner notes that such limitations are not in the independent claims. Even so, since barcodes are read via illumination and do not require contact to be read, it is understood that they can be read once they are printed out.

Further, the Examiner notes that just because a barcode can/is read immediately after printing, such teachings do not appear to limit the barcode in the sense that it is structurally different or cannot be read at a different time, or that it is somehow different from another printed barcode that is read later. The Examiner notes that once a barcode is printed, it can be read (it is capable of being read).

Further, while Fujiwara teaches the barcode is read immediately after printing, it is unclear why such teachings preclude using the recited materials for the marking. The Examiner notes that as first and second marking are taught by Fujiwara, and alternative marks are taught by the secondary references (with motivations for security/additional information permitted on the document), the Examiner notes that using such materials for the markings is an obvious expedient to produce the aforementioned expected results.

Simply put, the Examiner disagrees that somehow the fact that Fujiwara mentions reading immediately after printing somehow renders the combination of reference improper because the secondary references do not teach reading immediately after printing. The primary reference teaches reading immediately after printing. The secondary reference teach the use of alternative printing inks for expected results. The Examiner believes that the combination of Fujiwara with the secondary references would have been obvious to produce those expected results, and that barcodes, since they are read without contact and via illumination/imaging, are theoretically able to be read immediately after being made/printed.